

REMARKS

The present Amendment is filed concurrently with an RCE transmittal letter.

The present Amendment amends claim 7 to define the method as a method for casting a polyurethane resin into an impact-resistant polarized optical lens.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Carr. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

To support a 102 rejection, a single prior art reference must disclose each material feature of the rejected claims. Carr fails to disclose each material feature of the rejected claims.

Carr discloses a polyurethane resin derived from methylene bis (4-cyclohexylisocyanate). Carr fails to specifically disclose the use of the preferred methylene bis (4-cyclohexylisocyanate) used in the claimed invention, i.e. 4,4' methylene bis (cyclohexylisocyanate).

Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by Carr.

Moreover, it is clear that Carr fails to anticipate the method of claim 7, since Carr fails to disclose the method of claim 7 as amended above, in which the method forms an impact-resistant polarized optical lens.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Slagel and Smith. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Smith, newly cited, discloses bonding a polarized sheet to the surface of a plastic lens. Thus it is far different from the polarized lens formed by casting a polyurethane resin as defined in claim 7.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to form a lens of the type disclosed in Slagel using the composition disclosed in Carr, because the composition of Carr is a urethane elastomer, while Slagel clearly requires his composition to be non-elastomeric and have high hardness (see claim 1). (There is no such thing as a non-elastomeric, hard elastomer.)

Moreover, with or without the teachings of Slagel, to a person of ordinary skill in the art, a lens made of an elastomer would sound totally ridiculous. A person of ordinary skill in the art would find out that Carr's composition can be used for a lens only if he or she sees the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kanichi TAMURA et al.

By: Warren M. Cheek

Warren M. Cheek, Jr
Registration No. 33,367
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/edg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 27, 2003